

**KRAMER | AMADO^{PC}**PATENT RESEARCH SERVICES
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW1725 DUKE STREET
SUITE 240
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314
PHONE: (703) 519-9801
FACSIMILE: (703) 519-9802
WWW.KRAMERIP.COM**RECEIVED**
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 09 2006

Fax Memo

TO: Mail Stop AF
USPTO

FAX NO.: (571) 273-8300

FROM: Terry W. Kramer
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.

DATE: February 8, 2006

SUBJECT: U.S. Patent Application
Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REVOCATION LIST
MANAGEMENT
Serial No.: 09/456,689
Attorney Docket No.: A 23871

PAGES: (INCLUDING COVER PAGE) 13

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN is intended only for the exclusive use of the individual or entity named above. This facsimile may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this information is NOT the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or use of this information in any way is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please call us immediately and return the original information to us via U.S. Postal Service.

Message: Submitted herewith are the following:

- Transmittal Form(1 page)
- Fee Transmittal Form (2 pages)
- Notice of Appeal (1 page)
- Credit Card Form for \$500.00 (2 pages)
- Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (6 pages)

In the event that the fees submitted herewith are insufficient, please charge any remaining balance, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account Number 50-0578.

FEB 09 2006

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/456,689	
	Filing Date	December 09, 1999	
	First Named Inventor	Michael S. Pasieka	
	Art Unit	2136	
	Examiner Name	Pramila Parthasarathy	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	12	Attorney Docket Number	A 23871

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	Kramer & Amado, P.C.		
Signature	<i>Terry W. Kramer</i>		
Printed name	Terry W. Kramer		
Date	February 8, 2006	Reg. No.	41,541

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:			
Signature	<i>Angelica Rodriguez</i>		
Typed or printed name	Angelica Rodriguez	Date	2/8/06

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

FEB 09 2006

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through 10/01/2006 OMB 0651-0001
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) A 23871	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (571) 273-8300) on <u>2/8/2006</u> Signature <u>Angelica PS</u> Typed or printed name <u>ANGELICA RODRIGUEZ</u>		Application Number 09/456,689	Filed 12/09/1999
		First Named Inventor Michael S. Pasieka	
		Art Unit 2136	Examiner Pramila Parthasarathy
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.			
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.			
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the <input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor. <input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) <input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 <u>41,541</u>		<u>Terry W. Kramer</u> Signature Terry Kramer Typed or printed name 703-519-9801 Telephone number <u>February 8, 2006</u> Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>1</u> forms are submitted.			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AP, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

FEB 09 2006

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of	:	Michael S. Pasioka
	:	
For	:	METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR
	:	REVOCATION LIST
	:	MANAGEMENT
	:	
Serial No.:	:	09/456,689
	:	
Filed	:	December 09, 1999
	:	
Art Unit	:	2136
	:	
Examiner	:	Pramila Parthasarathy
	:	
Att. Docket	:	A 23871
	:	
Confirmation No.	:	6774

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action dated December 19, 2005.

MAIN REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 16 and 17 are independent claims. For purposes of this pre-appeal brief request, claim 1 is representative.

Claims 1-10 and 12-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,389,538 to Gruse et al., hereinafter "Gruse."

Claim 11 was found allowable by the Examiner if rewritten in independent form.

Application No: 09/456,689
Attorney's Docket No: A 23871
Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review

The present invention relates to a method, an apparatus and an article of manufacture for management of a revocation list. Claim 1 is directed to a method for controlling access to information comprising the steps of maintaining a contact list for a given entity and utilizing the contact list in conjunction with a revocation list associated with the given entity. The contact list comprises information identifying one or more other entities which have attempted to communicate with the given entity. The revocation list is used to determine which other entities are authorized to communicate with the given entity. Claim 16 is directed to an apparatus comprising a processor-based device adapted to implement the method of Claim 1. Claim 17 is directed to an article of manufacture comprising a storage medium containing software adapted to implement the method of Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that in the rejections of Claims 1, 16 and 17 under 102(e) over Gruse the Examiner failed to establish a *Prima Facie* case of anticipation.

Requirements for a *Prima Facie* case of anticipation under Section 102:

The test for anticipation under section 102 is whether each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP §2131. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); MPEP §2131. The elements must also be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicant submits that Gruse does not teach each and every element as set forth in Claim 1, either expressly or inherently.

Application No: 09/456,689
Attorney's Docket No: A 23871
Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review

In particular, Gruse fails to teach the step of maintaining, for a given entity, a contact list comprising information identifying other entities which have attempted to communicate with the given entity.

Gruse is directed to a system for tracking end-user electronic content usage. What Gruse describes (Col. 45:17-56) is a "Clearinghouse", which maintains a list of revoked digital certificates, not a "contact list comprising information identifying other entities which have attempted to communicate with" the Clearinghouse - in as much as the Clearinghouse of Gruse may be construed as the "given entity" of Claim 1, as the Examiner seems to do. The system described by Gruse actually corresponds to the conventional technique described in the "Background of the Invention" section of the present application (page 2, line 12 to page 3, line 11). In this kind of system an issuing authority (clearinghouse) maintains and periodically publishes an updated list of revoked identifiers. This updated list is communicated to each access control system (end user), which in turn uses said updated list to update its own, local revocation list. In the system described by Gruse there is no "contact list" used in conjunction with the "revocation list" as set forth in Claim 1. In the Final Office Action dated December 19, 2005, (page 4, lines 3-10) the Examiner cites two lists that are used by the Clearinghouse, and misconstrues one of them as the "contact list". A careful reading of Gruse shows that the two lists maintained by the Clearinghouse are: 1. a list of all the digital certificates that have been assigned; and 2. a list of the subset of digital certificates that have been revoked.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Gruse because Gruse does not teach each and every element as set forth in Claim 1. Additionally, Claims 2-15 ultimately depend from Claim 1 and are therefore also patentable over Gruse.

Regarding Claims 16 and 17, the Examiner stated in the Final Office Action dated December 19, 2005, that the limitations "a processor-based device" (Claim 16) and "a

Application No: 09/456,689
Attorney's Docket No: A 23871
Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review

machine-readable storage medium containing one or more software programs for use in controlling access to information" (Claim 17) have "not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble." Applicant respectfully, but strongly traverses this assertion, and submits that these limitations should be given full patentable weight. The MPEP, §2111.02 sets forth the effect of the preamble on patentability as follows:

"The determination of whether a preamble limits a claim is made on a case-by-case basis in light of the facts in each case; there is no litmus test defining when a preamble limits the scope of a claim. *Catalina Mktg. Int'l v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.*, 289 F.3d 801, 808, 62 USPQ2d 1781, 1785 Fed. Cir. 2002)."

The Examiner did not provide any arguments supporting the decision to deny any patentable weight to the preambles of Claims 16 and 17.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that the Examiner did in fact mistakenly place the above-recited limitations in the preambles of Claims 16 and 17 when they are actually not part of said preambles. These limitations are recited after the transitional phrase "comprising" and should therefore be given full weight in defining the scope of the claims, as set forth in the MPEP, §2111.03:

"The transitional phrases "comprising", "consisting essentially of" and "consisting of" define the scope of a claim with respect to what unrecited additional components or steps, if any, are excluded from the scope of the claim." see also:

"*Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.*, 112 F.3d 495, 501, 42 USPQ2d 1608, 1613 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("Comprising" is a term of art used in claim language which means that the named elements are essential, but other elements may be added and still form a construct within the scope of the claim.)"

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the limitations "a processor-based device" (Claim 16) and "a machine-readable storage medium containing one or more software programs for use in controlling access to information" (Claim 17) should be given their full and due patentable weight, and that the cited art reference does not teach or suggest

Application No: 09/456,689
Attorney's Docket No: A 23871
Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review


these limitations in conjunction with the other patentable features as set forth in Claims 16 and 17. Additionally, Claims 18-20 ultimately depend from either Claim 16 or Claim 17 and are therefore also patentable over the cited art reference.

Conclusion

While we believe that the instant pre-appeal brief places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.


Terry Kramer
Registration No.: 41,541

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-519-9801
Fax: 703-519-9802

Date: February 8, 2006